

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
12

13 L. SEVILLE PARKS, ) 3:04-cv-00501-HDM-VPC  
14 Plaintiff, )  
15 vs. ) ORDER  
16 DEBRA BROOKS, et al., )  
17 Defendants. )  
18

19 The plaintiff has filed objections (#260) to several recent  
20 minute orders denying his requests for leave to file documents with  
21 the court (Docs. #250, #252, #253, #254, #255, #256, and #257).<sup>1</sup>  
22 On September 13, 2005, plaintiff was declared a vexatious litigant  
23 by this court. (See Doc. #166). Pursuant to this declaration,  
24 plaintiff was restricted from filing any documents or motions with  
25 the court without first securing leave. Accordingly, denial of

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Docket number 251 is the court's minute order setting the trial date  
28 in this matter. Even though plaintiff included this minute order in his  
objections, he does not explain why he objects to this order. Accordingly,  
it appears #251 was included by mistake, and the court will not address  
plaintiff's objection to it.

1 leave to file was proper and plaintiff's objections are **DENIED**.  
2 Plaintiff also objects to the failure to provide him with a consent  
3 form pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 73. Rule 73 involves the trial of  
4 a matter by a magistrate judge instead of a district judge if both  
5 parties so consent. It does not, as plaintiff appears to  
6 contemplate, allow a party to determine whether and which  
7 magistrate judge will conduct pretrial proceedings in his or her  
8 case. Further, both parties must consent to having a magistrate  
9 conduct all trial proceedings. As there is no evidence on the  
10 record that defendants have so consented, plaintiff's objection is  
11 moot.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 DATED: This 4th day of November, 2009.

14   
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28